IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

TUESDAY, THE 24TH JULY 2007 / 2ND SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 22620 of 2007(P)

PETITIONERS:
----

1. A. RAJAMANIKKAM,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD, RESIDING AT PALATHULLI HOUSE,
PERUVAMBA P.O., PALAKKAD.

2. E.C. KRISHNA,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD, RESIDING AT KRISHNABHAVANAM,
PATTACHANKAVU, THENARI P.O., PALAKKAD.

3. I. CHINNAPPAN,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H.SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD, RESIDING AT AMZAING GRACE,
CADET AVENUE, CHITTOOR COLLEGE P.O., PALAKKAD.

BY ADV. SRI.M.C.CHERIAN
SRI.M.A.THOMAS KUTTY
SMT.ASHA CHERIAN
SRI.P.M.SANEER

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SUB DIVISION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD.

2. THE ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SUB DIVISION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD.

3. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,
KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, JALABHAVAN,
VELLAYAMBALAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. N. SANTHOSH,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD.

5. T. BHASKARAN,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD.

6. S. PAZHANINATHAN,
OPERATOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY, P.H. SECTION,
CHITTOOR, PALAKKAD.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. BIJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 24/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C) No. 22620 of 2007-P

JUDGMENT

The petitioners are Pump Operators, working under the respondents. At present, they are attached to the P.H. Section, Chittur in Palakkad district. By Ext.P1 order dated 12.7.2007, they have been transferred to two different stations, which are at a distance of 25 to 35 kms., it is submitted. Going by Ext.P1, it would show that the 1st respondent conducted an inspection at P.H. Section, Chittur on 9.7.2007. Based on the said inspection, this transfer order is issued. The petitioners would submit that on the said day they were working at the P.H. Section and they had not seen the 1st respondent coming there or conducting an inspection. The present transfer is to far off places, which is causing serious inconvenience to them, it is submitted. So, they pray to quash Ext.P1.

2. This Court can interfere with a transfer order, if only it is shown to be issued in violation of any statutory provision or vitiated by mala fides. I find that no such ground has been made out in this writ petition, warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The personal inconveniences of the petitioners

are not grounds for interfering with a transfer by this Court. But, if the petitioners file any representation highlighting their grievances against the transfer before the 3rd respondent, the said respondent will consider and pass orders on it as expeditiously as possible, preferably within one month from the date of receipt of the said representation.

Subject to that direction, the writ petition is dismissed.

K. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,

24th July, 2007. JUDGE.

Nm/